



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/913,686	01/24/2002	Niels Rump	SCHO0093	3745
7590	11/03/2005			EXAMINER
GLENN PATENT GROUP			HENNING, MATTHEW T	
3475 Edison Way			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Suite L				
Menlo Park, CA 94025			2131	

DATE MAILED: 11/03/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/913,686	RUMP ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Matthew T. Henning	2131

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 August 2005.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-30 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) 1-16 is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 24 January 2002 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
 6) Other: _____.

This action is in response to the communication filed on 8/17/2005.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

4 Applicant's arguments filed 8/17/2005 have been fully considered but they are not
5 persuasive.

6 Applicant argues primarily that Van Oorschot did not disclose that a first portion of the
7 payload was encrypted while a second portion of the payload was not, but instead that the entire
8 message of Van Oorschot was encrypted. The examiner has considered the argument and does
9 not find the argument persuasive. The claim does not specify that payload data only consists of
10 message data, and therefore even though Van Oorschot did disclose encrypting the entire
11 message, Van Oorschot also clearly disclosed sending the public key of A with the message in
12 unencrypted form (See Van Oorschot Col. 6 Lines 45-47). Van Oorschot also disclosed using
13 this unencrypted public key in the same manner as claimed for the second section of the payload
14 as has been shown in the rejections below. As such, Van Oorschot meets these limitations of the
15 claims. Therefore, the examiner does not find the arguments persuasive.

16 Claims 1-30 have been examined and claim 31 has been cancelled.

17 All objections and rejections not set forth below have been withdrawn.

Claim Objections

19 Claims 1-16 are objected to because of the following informalities: Claim 1 Line 8
20 recites “-of”. The examiner believes the ‘-‘ was not meant to be in the claim and should
21 therefore be removed. Appropriate correction is required.

1

2 *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

3 The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the
4 basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

5 *A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –*

6 (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section
7 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or
8 (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the
9 invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the
10 treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an
11 application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United
12 States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

14 Claims 1-7, 14, 16-17, 19, 23, 25-28, and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being
15 anticipated by Van Oorschot et al. (US Patent Number 5,850,443) hereinafter referred to as Van
16 Oorschot.

17 Regarding claim 1, Van Oorschot disclosed a method for producing a payload data
18 stream comprising a header and a payload data block containing encrypted payload data (See
19 Van Oorschot Fig. 3 X-fields, header fields, and encrypted message field), comprising the
20 following steps: generating a payload data key for a payload data encryption algorithm for
21 encrypting payload data (See Van Oorschot Col. 6 Lines 41-43 and Fig. 3 “Create low trust
22 symmetric key” K’); encrypting a first section of the payload data using said payload data key
23 and said payload data encryption algorithm to obtain an encrypted section of said payload data
24 block of said payload data stream (See Van Oorschot Col. 6 Lines 42-43 and Fig. 3 “Symmetric
25 encryption” and “encrypted message”), wherein a second section of the payload data remains
26 unencrypted (See Van Oorschot Col. 6 Lines 45-47 “public key of entity A”); processing the

1 unencrypted section of said payload data (See Van Oorschot Col. 6 Lines 45-50 “hash of X”
2 which contains the public key of A) to deduce information characterizing the unencrypted
3 second section of said payload data (See Van Oorschot Col. 6 Lines 49-60 h40(X)); linking said
4 information and said payload data key by means of an invertible logic linkage to obtain a basic
5 value (See Van Oorschot Col. 6 Lines 56-60 “K’ XOR h40(X)’); encrypting said basic value
6 using a key of two keys being different from each other by an asymmetrical encryption method,
7 said two different keys being the public and the private keys respectively for said asymmetrical
8 encryption method, to obtain an output value being an encrypted version of said payload data key
9 (See Van Oorschot Col. 6 Line 60 – Col. 7 Line 7); and entering said output value into said
10 header of said payload data stream (See Van Oorschot Col. 6 Line 65 – Col. 7 Line 7 and Fig. 3
11 “A’s header field” and “B’s header field”).

12 Regarding claim 17, Van Oorschot disclosed a method for decrypting an encrypted
13 payload data stream comprising a header and a payload data block containing a first section
14 having encrypted payload data (encrypted message) and a second section having unencrypted
15 payload data (public key of A), said header comprising an output value having been generated by
16 an encryption of a basic value by an asymmetrical encryption method using a key of two
17 different keys including a private and a public key, said basic value representing a linkage of a
18 payload data key, with which said first section having encrypted payload data is encrypted using
19 a payload data encryption algorithm, and information deduced by a certain processing of the
20 unencrypted second section of the payload data, said information characterizing a certain part of
21 said payload data stream unambiguously (See rejection of claim 1 above), said method
22 comprising the following steps: obtaining said output value from said header (See Van Oorschot

1 Fig. 4 “B’s Header Field” and Col. 4 Lines 51-52); decrypting said output value using the other
2 key of said asymmetrical encryption method to obtain said basic value (See Van Oorschot Fig. 4
3 “private key decryption” and “B’s high trust private key” and Col. 4 Lines 53-54); processing
4 the unencrypted second section of said payload data stream using the processing method used
5 when encrypting to deduce information characterizing the unencrypted second (See Van
6 Oorschot Fig. 4 “X-fields” and Col. 6 Lines 45-47); linking said information and said basic value
7 using the corresponding linkage as it has been used when encrypting to obtain said payload data
8 key (See Van Oorschot Fig. 4 “Unlevelling” and “X-fields” and Col. 4 Lines 54-56); and
9 decrypting the first section containing the encrypted payload data using said payload data key
10 and said payload data encryption algorithm used when encrypting (See Van Oorschot Fig. 4
11 “symmetric decryption” and “message”).

12 Regarding claim 28, Van Oorschot disclosed a device for producing a payload data
13 stream comprising a header and a payload data block containing encrypted payload data (See
14 Van Oorschot Fig. 3 X-fields, header fields, and encrypted message field), comprising: a
15 generator for generating a payload data key for a payload data encryption algorithm for
16 encrypting payload data (See Van Oorschot Col. 6 Lines 41-43 and Fig. 3 “Create low trust
17 symmetric key” K’); a first encryptor for encrypting a first section of the payload data using said
18 payload data key and said payload data encryption algorithm to obtain an encrypted section of
19 said payload data block of said payload data stream (See Van Oorschot Col. 6 Lines 42-43 and
20 Fig. 3 “Symmetric encryption” and “encrypted message”), wherein a second section of the
21 payload data remains unencrypted (See Van Oorschot Col. 6 Lines 45-47 “public key of entity
22 A”); a processor for processing the unencrypted section of said payload data (See Van Oorschot

1 Col. 6 Lines 45-50 "hash of X" which contains the public key of A) to deduce information
2 characterizing the unencrypted second section of said payload data (See Van Oorschot Col. 6
3 Lines 49-60 h40(X)); a linker for linking said information and said payload data key by means of
4 an invertible logic linkage to obtain a basic value (See Van Oorschot Col. 6 Lines 56-60 "K'
5 XOR h40(X")); a second encryptor for encrypting said basic value using a key of two keys being
6 different from each other by an asymmetrical encryption method, said two different keys being
7 the public and the private keys respectively for said asymmetrical encryption method, to obtain
8 an output value being an encrypted version of said payload data key (See Van Oorschot Col. 6
9 Line 60 – Col. 7 Line 7); and entering said output value into said header of said payload data
10 stream (See Van Oorschot Col. 6 Line 65 – Col. 7 Line 7 and Fig. 3 "A's header field" and "B's
11 header field").

12 Regarding claim 30, Van Oorschot disclosed a device for decrypting an encrypted
13 payload data stream comprising a header and a payload data block containing a first section
14 having encrypted payload data (encrypted message) and a second section having unencrypted
15 payload data (public key of A), said header comprising an output value having been generated by
16 an encryption of a basic value by an asymmetrical encryption method using a key of two
17 different keys including a private and a public key, said basic value representing a linkage of a
18 payload data key, with which said first section having encrypted payload data is encrypted using
19 a payload data encryption algorithm, and information deduced by a certain processing of the
20 unencrypted second section of the payload data, said information characterizing a certain part of
21 said payload data stream unambiguously (See rejection of claim 1 above), said device further
22 comprising: means for obtaining said output value from said header (See Van Oorschot Fig. 4

Art Unit: 2131

1 “B’s Header Field” and Col. 4 Lines 51-52); a first decryptor for decrypting said output value
2 using the other key of said asymmetrical encryption method to obtain said basic value (See Van
3 Oorschot Fig. 4 “private key decryption” and “”B’s high trust private key” and Col. 4 Lines 53-
4 54); a processor for processing the unencrypted second section of said payload data stream using
5 the processing method used when encrypting to deduce information characterizing the
6 unencrypted second (See Van Oorschot Fig. 4 “X-fields” and Col. 6 Lines 45-47); a linker for
7 linking said information and said basic value using the corresponding linkage as it has been used
8 when encrypting to obtain said payload data key (See Van Oorschot Fig. 4 “Unlevelling” and
9 “X-fields” and Col. 4 Lines 54-56); and a second decryptor decrypting the first section
10 containing the encrypted payload data using said payload data key and said payload data
11 encryption algorithm used when encrypting (See Van Oorschot Fig. 4 “symmetric decryption”
12 and “message”).

13 Regarding claim 2, Van Oorschot disclosed that said payload data encryption algorithm is
14 a symmetrical encryption algorithm (See Van Oorschot Fig. 3 “symmetric encryption”).

15 Regarding claim 3, Van Oorschot disclosed that said invertible logic linkage is self-
16 inverting and includes an XOR- linkage (See Van Oorschot Col. 6 Lines 56-60).

17 Regarding claim 4, Van Oorschot disclosed that one key of said two keys being different
18 from each other is the private key of a producer of said payload data stream or the public key of a
19 consumer of said payload data stream (See Van Oorschot Fig. 3 B’s high trust public key).

20 Regarding claim 5, Van Oorschot disclosed that said part of said payload data stream
21 being processed to deduce said information includes at least a part of said header (See Van
22 Oorschot Fig. 3 “X-Field” and Col. 6 Lines 49-55).

1 Regarding claim 6, Van Oorschot disclosed that said step of processing comprises
2 forming a hash sum (See Van Oorschot Col. 6 Lines 49-55).

3 Regarding claim 7, Van Oorschot disclosed further comprising the following step:
4 identifying an algorithm being used in said step of processing by an entry into said header (See
5 Van Oorschot Abstract Lines 14-16).

6 Regarding claim 14, Van Oorschot disclosed that said step of processing further
7 comprises the following sub-step: setting said entry for said output value in said header to a
8 defined value and processing said entire header, including said entry set to a defined value (See
9 Van Oorschot Fig. 3 “X-Field” and Col. 6 Lines 49-55).

10 Regarding Claim 16, Van Oorschot disclosed the following step: identifying said payload
11 data encryption algorithm by an entry into said header of said payload data stream (See Van
12 Oorschot Abstract Lines 14-16).

13 Regarding claim 19, Van Oorschot disclosed that said part being processed to deduce said
14 information is said header (See Van Oorschot Fig. 4 “X-Fields”).

15 Regarding claim 23, Van Oorschot disclosed that one key having been used when
16 encrypting is the public key of said asymmetrical encryption method, while the other key having
17 been used when decrypting is the private key of said asymmetrical encryption method (See Van
18 Oorschot Fig. 3 “B’s high trust public key” and Fig 4 “B’s high trust private key”).

19 Regarding claim 24, Van Oorschot disclosed that said step of processing includes
20 forming a hash sum (See Van Oorschot Col. 6 Lines 49-55 and Fig. 4 “Unlevelling”).

21 Regarding claim 25, Van Oorschot disclosed that a part of said header having been set to
22 a defined value for said step of processing when encrypting is set to the same defined value for

Art Unit: 2131

1 said step of processing when decrypting (See Van Oorschot Fig. 3 “X-fields” and Fig. 4 “X-
2 fields” wherein they must be the same defined value because they were both set by the sender
3 upon sending).

4 Regarding claim 26, Van Oorschot disclosed that said part of said header being set to a
5 defined value includes said entry for said output value of said header (See Van Oorschot Fig. 3
6 “B’s header field” and Fig. 4 “B’s header field” wherein they must be the same defined value
7 because they were both set by the sender upon sending).

8 Regarding claim 27, Van Oorschot disclosed that said step of linking comprises using an
9 XOR-linkage (See Van Oorschot Col. 6 Lines 56-60 and Col. 4 Lines 54-56 and Fig. 4
10 “Unlevelling”).

11 *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

12 The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all
13 obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

14 *A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or
15 described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter
16 sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have
17 been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to
18 which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which
19 the invention was made.*

21 Claims 8, 11-12, 18, and 20-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable
22 over Van Oorschot as applied to claims 1 and 17 above, and further in view of Matyas et al. (US
23 Patent Number 5,200,999) hereinafter referred to as Matyas.

24 Van Oorschot disclosed a system for sending a message from a sender to a receiver in
25 which the message was encrypted using a key, the key was encrypted, and then the key was sent
26 to the receiver with the encrypted message (See Van Oorschot Abstract and Fig. 3). Van

Art Unit: 2131

1 Oorschot further disclosed decrypting the key, and using the key to decrypt the message at the
2 receiver (See Van Oorschot Abstract and Fig. 4). However, Van Oorschot failed to disclose
3 sending license data along with the key and message.

4 Matyas teaches that when sending a key, in order to authenticate the use of the key, and
5 the validity of the key, certain data (License data) should be placed in the header along with the
6 key. This data includes key type, key usage data (for history purposes), algorithm identifier,
7 algorithm-specific data, key start date/time, key expiration data/time, device identifier, user
8 identifier, key identifier, logical device identifier, and user-defined data (See Matyas Col. 13
9 Line 66 – Col. 14 Lines 60). Matyas further teaches that this information should be verified
10 prior to use of the key (See Matyas Col. 100).

11 It would have been obvious to the ordinary person skilled in the art at the time of
12 invention to employ the teachings of Matyas in the key and message sending system and method
13 of Van Oorschot by placing the license information, taught by Matyas, in the header of the
14 message and checking this information prior to allowing the key and message to be decrypted.
15 This would have been obvious because the ordinary person skilled in the art would have been
16 motivated to protect the interests of the sender of the message and to ensure the security of the
17 message.

18 Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of
19 Van Oorschot and Matyas as applied to claim 8 above, and further in view of Klemba et al. (US
20 Patent Number 5,710,814) hereinafter referred to as Klemba.

21 Van Oorschot and Matyas disclosed sending license data for controlling the usage of a
22 key and message, including usage history (See rejection of claim 8 above), but failed to disclose
23 the data including how often the message could be decrypted.

24 Klemba teaches that license data can be used to control the number of uses of a
25 cryptographic function (See Klemba Col. 14 Lines 14-19).

26 It would have been obvious to the ordinary person skilled in the art at the time of
27 invention to employ the teachings of Klemba in the messaging system and method of Van

1 Oorschot and Matyas by using the license information to limit the number of times the message
2 could be decrypted. This would have been obvious because the ordinary person skilled in the art
3 would have been motivated to protect the interests of the sender of the message as well as to
4 protect the message against compromise.

5 Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination
6 of Van Oorschot and Matyas as applied to claim 8 above, and further in view of Edenson et al.
7 (Us Patent Number 6,198,875) hereinafter referred to as Edenson.

8 Van Oorschot and Matyas disclosed sending license data for controlling the usage of a
9 key and message, including usage history (See rejection of claim 8 above), but failed to disclose
10 the data including how often the message could be copied and how often it had already been
11 copied.

12 Edenson teaches that license information can include how many copies of licensed data
13 can be made (See Edenson Col. 4 Paragraph 2).

14 It would have been obvious to the ordinary person skilled in the art at the time of
15 invention to employ the teachings of Edenson in the messaging system of Van Oorschot and
16 Matyas by including information regarding the number of allowed copies of the message that are
17 permitted. This would have been obvious because the ordinary person skilled in the art would
18 have been motivated to protect the interests of the message sender, and to protect the message
19 itself from unauthorized distribution. Further, it would have been necessary to also keep track of
20 the number of copies already made in order to enforce the copy limit.

1 Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination
2 of Van Oorschot and Matyas as applied to claim 8 above, and further in view of Schneier
3 ("Applied Cryptography Second Edition").

4 Van Oorschot and Matyas disclosed sending license data for controlling the usage of a
5 key and message, including usage history (See rejection of claim 8 above), but failed to disclose
6 including the license in the hash function.

7 Schneier teaches that hashes are used to authenticate the data being hashed upon receipt
8 of the data in order to detect any unauthorized changes to the data (See Schneier Pages 30-31
9 Section 2.4).

10 It would have been obvious to the ordinary person skilled in the art at the time of
11 invention to employ the teachings of Schneier in the messaging system of Van Oorschot and
12 Matyas by hashing the License data along with the X-fields. This would have been obvious
13 because the ordinary person skilled in the art would have been motivated to protect against
14 undetected changes to the license data sent with the message.

15 Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Van Oorschot as
16 applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Roediger (US Patent Number 4,899,333).
17 Van Oorschot disclosed sending a message from a sender to a receiver, including a header and a
18 hash of the header (See Van Oorschot Col. 6), but Van Oorschot failed to disclose including a
19 sender identifier and a receiver identifier in the header, or in the hash.

20 Roediger teaches that packet headers contain a source address (sender identifier) and a
21 destination address (recipient identifier) and that a checksum should include these fields in order
22 to ensure that the fields are not corrupted (See Roediger Col. 37 Lines 53-63).

1 It would have been obvious to the ordinary person skilled in the art at the time of
2 invention to employ the teachings of Roediger in the messaging system of Van Oorschot by
3 including source and destination addresses in the header and including these in the hash. This
4 would have been obvious because the ordinary person skilled in the art would have been
5 motivated to provide means for routing the message from the sender to the receiver and allowing
6 the receiver to verify that it was the intended receiver of the message.

7 Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Van Oorschot as
8 applied to claim 17 above, and further in view of Schneier.

9 Van Oorschot disclosed using a public key of the receiver for encryption (See rejection of
10 claim 23 above) but failed to disclose using a private key of an asymmetrical key pair for
11 encryption.

12 Schneier teaches that by encrypting data using a senders private key, the receiver can use
13 the senders public key to authenticate the sender of the data (See Schneier Pages 53-54).

14 It would have been obvious to employ the teachings of Schneier in the messaging system
15 of Van Oorschot by encrypting the leveled key with the private key of the sender and decrypting
16 it with the public key of the sender. This would have been obvious because the ordinary person
17 skilled in the art would have been motivated to provide sender authentication at the receiver.

18 Claim 29 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Van Oorschot as
19 applied to claims 28 and 30 above, and further in view of Kane et al. (US Patent Number
20 5,315,635) hereinafter referred to as Kane.

1 Van Oorschot disclosed sending messages from a sender to a receiver (See Van Oorschot
2 Abstract), but failed to disclose the sending being from a personal computer to a personal
3 computer.

4 Kane teaches that messages can be sent between personal computers (See Kane Col. 1
5 Lines 45-51).

6 It would have been obvious to the ordinary person skilled in the art at the time of
7 invention to employ the teachings of Kane in the messaging system of Van Oorschot by sending
8 the encrypted messages from a sending personal computer to receiving personal computer. This
9 would have been obvious because the ordinary person skilled in the art would have been
10 motivated to protect messages sent between two personal computers.

Conclusion

Claims 1-30 have been rejected and claim 31 has been cancelled.

13 **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time
14 policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

15 A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE
16 MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO
17 MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after
18 the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period
19 will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37
20 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,
21 however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing
22 date of this final action.

1 Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the
2 examiner should be directed to Matthew T. Henning whose telephone number is (571) 272-3790.
3 The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8-4.

4 If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's
5 supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh can be reached on (571) 272-3795. The fax phone number for the
6 organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

7 Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent
8 Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications
9 may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished
10 applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR
11 system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR
12 system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

13

14

15 
16 Matthew Henning
17 Assistant Examiner
18 Art Unit 2131
19 10/28/2005

20

21


AYAZ SHEIKH
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100